## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To: Johnstone, Douglas lan BARON & WARREN 19 South End, Kensingto London W8 5BU GRANDE BRETAGNE	BARON & WARREN • RECEIVED 2 5 0CT 2004						-
		KEW	7	8004	1)	PASC	3
	Г	APW	1	BJ		AOC	V
	Г	8008	T	TWF	2	MK	
•	e	OMP. E	MARO	/ No.			$\prod$

### PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Rule 71.1)

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

25.10.2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference MR/38023

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

International application No. PCT/GB 03/02771

27.06.2003

28.06.2002

Applicant

ALPHA THAMES LTD

- 1. The applicant is hereby notified that this International Preliminary Examining Authority transmits herewith the international preliminary examination report and its annexes, if any, established on the international application.
- A copy of the report and its annexes, if any, is being transmitted to the International Bureau for communication to all the elected Offices.
- 3. Where required by any of the elected Offices, the International Bureau will prepare an English translation of the report (but not of any annexes) and will transmit such translation to those Offices.

#### 4. REMINDER

The applicant must enter the national phase before each elected Office by performing certain acts (filing translations and paying national fees) within 30 months from the priority date (or later in some Offices) (Article 39(1)) (see also the reminder sent by the International Bureau with Form PCT/IB/301).

Where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary examination report. It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned.

For further details on the applicable time limits and requirements of the elected Offices, see Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide.

The applicant's attention is drawn to Article 33(5), which provides that the criteria of novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability described in Article 33(2) to (4) merely serve the purposes of international preliminary examination and that "any Contracting State may apply additional or different criteria for the purposes of deciding whether, in that State, the claimed inventions is patentable or not" (see also Article 27(5)). Such additional criteria may relate, for example, to exemptions from patentability, requirements for enabling disclosure, clarity and support for the claims.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:

<u>@</u>)

European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016 Authorized Officer

Ter Haar, H

Tel. +31 70 340-3817





## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

	3023	ent's file reference	FOR FURTHER	ACTION		ation of Transmittal of International Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)
		lication No.	International filing da	te (day/mont	h/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/G	B 03/0	2771	27.06.2003			28.06.2002
Internati E21B2		ent Classification (IPC) or	both national classification	on and IPC		
Applicar ALPHA		MES LTD				
1. TI	his inter uthority	national preliminary exa and is transmitted to th	amination report has be e applicant according	een prepar to Article 36	ed by this Ir 5.	nternational Preliminary Examining
		•	•		•	
2. Th	his REP	ORT consists of a total	of 5 sheets, including	this cover	sheet.	
⊠	bee	report is also accompa n amended and are the Rule 70.16 and Sectio	basis for this report a	nd/or sheet:	s containing	otion, claims and/or drawings which have grectifications made before this Authority refer the PCT).
Th	nese anı	nexes consist of a total	of 2 sheets.			
						•
3. Th	nis repor	t contains indications re	elating to the following	items:		
1	$\boxtimes$	•	•			
		Basis of the opinion				
11		Basis of the opinion Priority				
		Priority	opinion with regard to	novelty, in	ventive step	and industrial applicability
		Priority		novelty, in	ventive step	and industrial applicability
III		Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v	with regard	:	and industrial applicability inventive step or industrial applicability;
III IV		Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ions supporting such s	with regard	:	
III IV V		Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement ocitations and explanat	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ions supporting such s ed	with regard statement	:	
VI		Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement citations and explanat Certain documents cit	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ions supporting such s ed international applicatio	with regard statement on	:	
III IV V VI		Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement citations and explanat Certain documents cit Certain defects in the	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ions supporting such s ed international applicatio	with regard statement on	:	
VI VII		Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement citations and explanat Certain documents cit Certain defects in the	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ions supporting such s ed international applicatio	with regard statement on olication	:	inventive step or industrial applicability;
VI VIII VIII	ubmission	Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement of citations and explanat Certain documents cit Certain defects in the Certain observations of	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ions supporting such s ed international applicatio	with regard statement on olication	to novelty,	inventive step or industrial applicability;
VI VII VII ate of su	U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U	Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement of citations and explanat Certain documents cit Certain defects in the Certain observations of	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vions supporting such sed international application the international app	with regard statement on olication	to novelty, in the completion of the completion	inventive step or industrial applicability;
VI VII VIII VIII 6.01.20	Ubmission  O04  I mailing yexamin  Euro NL-2	Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of invent Reasoned statement of citations and explanat Certain documents cit Certain defects in the Certain observations of of the demand	ion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) vions supporting such sed international application the international application and the internation and t	Date of co	ompletion of 004	inventive step or industrial applicability;

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/GB 03/02771

I. Basis	s of the	report
----------	----------	--------

With regard to the elements of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):
 Description, Pages

1-6 as originally filed

Claims, Numbers

1-9 filed with telefax on 24.09.2004

Drawings, Sheets

1/4-4/4 as originally filed

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were a

□ contained in the international application in written form.
 □ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 □ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
 □ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
 □ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
 □ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.
 4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages:☐ the claims, Nos.:☐ the drawings, sheets:

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/GB 03/02771

5. 🗆	This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have
	been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N) Yes: Claims 1-9

No: Claims

Inventive step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-9

No: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-9

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet



#### Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- The following documents are referred to in this communication: 1.
  - D1: EP-A-0.201 263 (MOBIL NORTH SEA LTD) 12 Nov. 1986 (1986-11-12)
  - D2: WO 01/87453 A (TVEITEN MAGNAR ;KELLOGG BROWN & ROOT INC (US)) 22 Nov. 2001 (2001-11-22)
- The document D2, which is considered to be the closest prior art, discloses in 2. particular in page 4 line 2-5, page 8 line 18-20, page 9 line 17 to page 10 line 8 and figures 1-5 (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A system (100) for removing particulates from water, comprising separating means (130) for removing particulates from water, and pumping means (144) downstream from the separating means for drawing water upstream of the separating means into the separating means, characterised in that the separating means comprises dynamic separating means comprising a hydrocyclone (page 4, line 3) and the system further includes means (133) for collecting particulates separated from said water by the dynamic separating means, means (136) for removing collected particulates from the particulate collecting means.

The system of D2 differs from the subject-matter of claim 1 by the fact that a) claim 1 is aimed at an underwater hydrocarbon reservoir water injection system rather than a system for the disposal of drilling solids,

- b) in claim 1 the system draws in surrounding water, which is not the case in D2,
- c) the system of claim 1 is incorporated into a retrievable module for use with a modular seabed processing system,
- d) the system of claim 1 contains means for directing at least some of the at least substantially particulate free water from the dynamic separating means to the particulate removal means to enable the particulate removal means (7,32) to remove collected particulates and eject them into water surrounding the module.
- The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT). 2.1 Aspect a) and b), both part of the preamble of the independent system claim are known in the art, see for example D1. Aspect c), i.e. incorporation into a retrievable module is considered to be trivial to

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY



EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET

the skilled man in the art.

The remaining problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as:

Removing collected particulates (page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 2)

2.2 The solution to this problem proposed in claim. 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:

By directing some particulate free water from the dynamic separating means to the particulate removal means to eject the collected particulates into surrounding water, the power available from the dynamic separating means is used to remove collected particulates, thereby avoiding the need of a separate system to remove collected particulates.

- 2.3 Claims 2-7 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- 2.4 Since the subject-matter of independent method claim 8 corresponds to the subject-matter of claim 1, the same reasoning as given for claim 1 will apply mutatis mutandis. Therefore claim 8 also meets the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).
- 2.5 Claim 9 is dependent on claim 8 and as such also meets the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

#### **OTHER REMARKS**

No documents reflecting the prior art, such as D1 and D2, are identified in the description (Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT).